1-25-1989

Muskie, Edmund S. oral history interview

Frank B. Poyas

Interview with Edmund S. Muskie by Frank B. Poyas

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996

Interviewer
Poyas, Frank B.

Date
January 25, 1989

Place
Washington, D.C.

ID Number
MOH 018

Scope and Content Note

This is the fourth and final of a series of interviews with Edmund S. Muskie conducted by Frank Poyas. At the time of the interview, Poyas was historian of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park and Muskie was serving his eighth term as Park Chairman. The interview is dedicated to discussions of many aspects of the Park's history and operation. Topics include special events, such as the Park's 25th anniversary. The interview also covers other topics, including the proposed Pittston and Machiasport refineries and litigation thereabout; national interest in Maine's resources; Stewart Udall's proposal for a park in Maine; balancing environmental concerns with promoting and allowing visitors to enjoy the benefits of state parks; Harvard School of Design's proposed innovations to Roosevelt Campobello International Park; interrelations between the National Park Service, Parks Canada, and the RCIP commission; Canadian employees of the park and their wages; Muskie's predictions and concerns for the future of the park: tourism, the Roosevelt memory; other memorial parks vs. presidential libraries; attractions of the park; and the role of Commissioner of the Park.

Indexed Names

Bailey, Harold
Brennan, Joseph E.

Cohen, William S.
Elizabeth, Queen, consort of George VI, King of Great Britain, 1900-2002
Ford, Gerald R., 1913-
Galbraith, John
Hammer, Armand, 1898-1990
Hatfield, Richard
Jordan, Barbara
Johnson, Lyndon B. (Lyndon Baines), 1908-1973
Kennedy, John F. (John Fitzgerald), 1917-1963
Pike, Radcliffe
Pike, Sumner T.
Reagan, Ronald
Roosevelt, Eleanor, 1884-1962
Roosevelt, Franklin D. (Franklin Delano), 1882-1945
Roosevelt, Franklin D. (Franklin Delano), 1914-1988
Schlesinger, Arthur Meier, 1917-
Seagraves, Eleanor, 1927-
Smith, William French, 1917-
Stuart, Lawrence
Truman, Harry S., 1884-1972
Udall, Stewart L.

Transcript

Frank Poyas: This is Frank Poyas from the Roosevelt Campobello International Park. This is the fourth and final interview done with Edmund S. Muskie at his office in Washington, D.C. on 25 January, 1989. Last time we were going over the special events of the park, and then we talked about the dedication, and the corner stone, and the opening when the Queen Mother came. Then there was quite a gap until 1982 when we had the FDR centennial celebration there. I was wondering first of all, between the queen's visit and the FDR centennial were there any special events, any anniversary events or particular things that stand out?

Edmund Muskie: The tenth year anniversary of the park. Wasn't much a celebration, but we had, Harry built a little platform over toward this Hubbard cottage, I think it's still there, where we had some speeches. Just, you know, I spoke, Franklin spoke, Ebner Robichaud did, I think he was on board then. No, and the visitors were around, gathered around. We didn't make any special thing about it. And I think we brought the Kilty Band down from New Brunswick, they were in the background and played. And that was about it, to sort of mark the anniversary. You can always find an anniversary of some kind. There's no reason why you couldn't have an eleventh anniversary celebration. That's not our way. But I don't recall we had any special guests for that occasion, or any special project to mark the occasion. We just thought we ought to have a celebration, it was congratulating ourselves I guess at arriving at the tenth year.

Beyond that, of course there was my own suspension from the commission while I was secretary of state. Of course every year we've had, until recently, we've had winter meetings up there at

different locations. We had, I think two down here in Washington, had one in Ottawa I remember. I think we may have had one in Toronto and/or Montreal. Had one in Boston. Did we have one in Bos-, we had one in New York. There was that two meetings at Hyde Park. One was I think the very first year or the first summer, we wanted to go down to Hyde Park just to see how Hyde Park was run and sort of get the atmosphere, and we were guests of Franklin at his home with his then wife. So I suppose there ought to be some place in the history marking those events. I can't remember anything, any particular thing that happened at any of those. I think the one in Ottawa may have been distinguished by the reception we received from the Canadian government, and the American ambassador in Ottawa, given at the governor's palace. Is that what they call it in Ottawa, palace?

FP: The Government House.

EM: Government House, I forget what they call it. And Ottawa I find a very attractive city. But other than that, no, I can't remember any other special things.

FP: Well, 1982 was the FDR centennial. That was a rather major event. I'd like to just hear some thoughts about that.

EM: Yes, we did regard it as a major event and I think we appropriated a sizeable amount of money for it. I'm not sure I can remember what we spent it for. Incidentally, the manuscript of Steve's book was acquired by the park, but not in '82. When did that happen? But I think it was in connection with the centennial that we had the book published based upon that project. Am I correct in that? I think that's right. Then we invited, I think Arthur Schlessinger came up to speak, and John Galbraith came up, and the speeches were on that porch overlooking the bay, we took down the railing. And I think we had three clergymen from the area. Like all clergymen, they talked too long but they don't often have that kind of a platform in that part of the country. We had a good audience as I remember. I think my slides will show that there was a goodly number turned out. I think we invited the governor of Maine and the governor of, or the premier of New Brunswick [Richard Hatfield] and other state officials. And we had two, I think two ships, U.S. Navy, or one of the U.S. Navy and one of the Canadian Navy, and they clustered offshore during the ceremony. I think we had that Canadian Kilty band again. It was a nice affair, beautiful day. Matter of fact, I think our regular meetings and the events we've had there have been marked by pretty nice weather most of the time. A higher percentage of nice days than you'd get year round at Campobello, so all these special events were usually, you know, bluebird days. Bluebird days in Campobello, you know, that clear pristine air and so on, just nice to be alive so they were always fun.

So that was a big celebration. Then we had a big luncheon, I think that was in the back of the Prince cottage on the porch. I think there must have been some tables off the porch, too, because it was a pretty good attendance. I can't remember if, I don't think there were any significant speeches at that except, you know, the routine kind of welcome. But the Galbraith speech was good. Franklin of course reminisced, and so did Schlesinger. All told, it was a nice day.

And then at night, of course we held it as I remember it at the same time as, I think it was one the fourth of July. Am I wrong there? I think that's right, and we chose that deliberately because

we could, it was made part of the fourth of July celebration of Eastport for example, and that night Eastport had a considerable fireworks display that we viewed through the oval window of the Hubbard cottage. Beautiful. So the area generally, you know, involved a lot of fourth of July celebrations. I think that was the first ceremony that was held on the bay side of the cottage instead of the other side. And I think on the whole it's probably a better place for it, unless it's a blowy day, then you might want it otherwise. Now, were there any other projects that were in connection with that? I think, let's see, Steve's book was produced, I think there was a very nice program with some history in it that was produced and sold. I guess that's about it, Frank.

FP: Okay, then two years later we had the Eleanor Roosevelt centennial.

EM: But that was held on the other side of the cottage. I think in large part out of deference to Barbara Jordan who agreed to come, and notwithstanding her wheelchair. And she gave a terrific speech on the anniversary of the Declaration of, what was it, Human Rights? Yeah, Human Rights, of which she was the principle author and force. Barbara, of course, is a terrific speaker as you know, so she was our speaker on that occasion. And I think we produced another publication which has been a good seller at Campobello. For the guest list you'd have to resort to the records. I know that was another, every one of these events that we've had have been very long, very moving, well received, a lot of enthusiasm, and you could sense that even the visitors who happened to be on the grounds at the time enjoyed them, so they were good events.

FP: And now we have coming up the twenty fifth anniversary. I wonder if you could perhaps say a few words about that, it's meaning, what's planned?

EM: Well, there's no particular reason to have a celebration except that it's sort of traditional to have twenty-fifth year celebrations in this country. But of course Franklin's death gives us another reason, and the commission has dedicated that to Franklin. Highly appropriate. I wish he'd lived at least until the twenty fifth but, he was born on the island, gave us an excellent opportunity to in effect dedicate the park to him as well as to FDR, which I think is appropriate. But that'll be an intimate party, it won't be a big one. And any visitors who happen to be around are certainly welcome to get involved in it, but we'll have an unveiling of a plaque and, which I think is appropriate. We may have two plaques if you find another one in the library. And a portrait, of course, of Franklin, Jr. And Arthur Schlesinger has agreed to come up to reminisce, which will be fun. That probably will be at a luncheon, that event. We'll probably have three events on that occasion, one unveiling the plaque, one unveiling the portrait, and then the lunch where the main speaker of the event, Arthur is, will be given. We don't see any need to have a speech at each of the other ceremonies except appropriate remarks to identify the reason. We might be more ambitious if we weren't so limited by budget at this time. Well, of course your history is part of this twenty-fifth year anniversary, very much so.

FP: Okay, I want to move on now to some particular issues and relationships. One of the big things that the park acquired when it received the land from Dead River was management of natural resources in the area. Under the rules of the various governments, we assumed the legal responsibility as well to maintain this, as well as a moral responsibility. Perhaps the major environmental issue that has come up over the past twenty-five years involving the commission was of course the planned refinery at Eastport, the Pittston Refinery. There was much

documentation available, many newspaper articles and things, so I don't think we need to get down to the nitty gritty detail, but I would be very interested in your informal review of that period as to how you saw the role of the commission during that, and how well you feel the commission lived up to its responsibilities and then the final outcome of the Pittston issue.

EM: Well that really didn't impact on the park. This was Machiasport, Pittston, I'm having a memory blank.

FP: This was the refinery they were going to build at the old air strip in Eastport, and with the park being the federal land manager there was a question of the air quality permit, EPA and the change of the rules under EPA.

EM: Well the par- I'm trying to think, I'm getting a little confused between that one and the proposed refinery at Machiasport, which is the, would have been originally a big one. And that was proposed, and I don't remember the year now. It was proposed in the Johnson administration and it was part of what had been a movement before then to try to develop Maine's energy resources, starting with Passamaquoddy Bay of course in the thirties, a project FDR was very much interested in. And then in the early Kennedy years I, prior to the time he became president, the National Park Service had proposed a plan, and I don't know who the initiators were, to, and this really I guess was during my term as governor, to create a national park in northern Maine encompassing the Allagash River, the St. John River, and quite a large area encompassing those two rivers. And that has sparked real controversy in the state, especially from the land owners who are larger paper companies, and big estates.

And so when Kennedy was elected, I asked him if he would have an evaluation made of that proposal taking into account, you know, all the resources that might be related, including the old Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and the national parks project, the St. John River and the Allagash River. And he assigned Stewart Udall and the Dept. of the Interior to do that. Independent with that but leading up to that had been an engineering study which had been authorized by the Congress, as I recall it, of the Passamaquoddy project, trying to bring it up to date because there'd been periodic efforts to revive that project. We've never seen it die totally. A lot people had dreams about what that could do for the state. So I asked him to take a good look at the whole bag.

And Udall came up with a proposal, favorable. I think reducing the size of the proposed park, national park, proposing in fact a wild river way around the Allagash, converting that into a white river experience, and a dam on the St. John River, tied to the Passamaquoddy project. The big problem it saw with the Passamaquoddy project standing by itself was that since its power was tide to the cycles, you know, the rise and fall of the moon, that its potential for power was limited on a steady basis, because that cycle was out of phase with the economy really. And so the St. John River project was perceived of as a way of leveling off, or filling up the gaps in the cycle, you see. And so they produced a report that was favorable, the Allagash Riverway and Passamaquoddy project revived, they called it the, what was the name of it, there'd been three different locations identified for the St. John River and I can't now, I forget which one it was tied to the Passamaquoddy. But in any case, we had a road show we put on with Udall presenting

this program, in Portland as I recall, in Bangor, I think also in Presque Isle, and in either Eastport or Lubec, I forget which it was.

So a great deal of enthusiasm was generated by it, at long last, you know, we got something going. Well, it didn't take long for that to become economically unfeasible, you know, as the technology and nuclear power that developed, and cost of construction and all the rest of it. Over the time that it took to, you know, put the thing in motion, the feasibility ratio dropped. We did pick up, however, the Allagash River project, converted it, let's see, when did we elect the Democratic legislature? I think that may have been '64 when we had the first Democratic legislature in more than fifty years. And the legislature created it as a state project, so the environmentalists locked that one up, put it away, and from then on they were against the power projects on the St. John and of course against Passamaquoddy. They figured they already, they had the Allagash there, which was what they were interested in, and the rest of it could go.

But we kept the St. John River project alive until I left the Senate, and then it died. Now, it was in the context of that forty or fifty year interest that the idea of power related to Maine's resources, and so the whole idea was proposed in Machiasport as a free port with power from oil. Of course Machiasport was on the coast, you had the benefit of ocean transportation of the oil. And that, and the Commerce Dept., I think it was Commerce Dept. approved Machias, Machiasport for a free port development. I know Dr. Hammer on behalf of his oil company testified and supported it. I presided over a hearing at Machiasport on that. Didn't have directly to do with the park at all, but the Pittston thing sort of followed on from that one. That one died because, you know, the environmental movement overwhelmed it, the Machiasport thing, and, what was the date of the Pittston project?

FP: Pittston dragged on -

EM: Until the seventies.

FP: It was the oil company that wanted to build a large refinery, they were going to bring these great oil tankers in around Campobello, right into Eastport.

EM: Yeah, their turning circle was to be right in front of the Roosevelt cottage. Yeah, that's right. Yeah, Pittston pushed that, I mean they were, the local people had mixed feelings about it as I remember. I'm not sure whether their ultimate vote was opposed to it or not. I have a vague recollection that it was. Not that their vote would be decisive, but we decided from the park's point of view that it was, would be damaging, and we opposed it. I think we had the legal talents of the Justice Dept. there made available to us. I forget who it was that represented us, but in any case that one died in due course. You can see my recollection of what happened isn't very sharp and I can remember better the Machiasport project than I can the Pittston one. But that doesn't mean the Pittston one wasn't very visible, it was, no question about it. There were strong views on either side of that one, but from the point of view of the park it would have been a disaster we thought.

And so we did get involved, and we always have a problem when we had this sort of an issue raised, you want to be properly represented. We don't have the kind of money to employ talent,

employ lawyers or whatever skills that might be appropriate, and so we're left, you know, with the device given us in our statute, which authorizes us to call on other agencies of the government to represent us. In that case, either the Justice Dept. represented us directly or they authorized to hire a counsel, I forget which, and they picked up the tab. I'm trying to remember the time frame. When did Pittston die?

FP: I think it went up until mid seventies at least. Once in a while they raised it again, but I think the final rejection of the air quality was mid seventies.

EM: Because it seems to me I remember that we needed legal counsel in the Reagan administration.

FP: I take that back, you're right, because we had obtained legal counsel prior to 1980. Our legal counsel was suddenly unfunded shortly after the new administration came in.

EM: Yeah, but William French, French was the, and he refused. We had some rather strong statements on both sides of that one. But in any case, we finally prevailed and it was fine, but the Reagan administration gave us no help at all on that one. I think we may have borrowed some money, or used some money out of our working capital to carry us through. We had outside counsel, that's right, I remember, we had outside counsel. Did a good job. I wish I could remember the course of the litigation and I could be a little sharper on exactly how we handled it. But the written record may give you what you need there. But that was a bitter one. And so the next one of course was the Georgia Pacific issue, I think that's the next one.

FP: Well, the Georgia Pacific, now is that the one that is currently -?

EM: Yeah.

FP: Is there anything that you can kind of say about that again as far as the role of the commission (*unintelligible phrase*).

EM: Well, we always feel we have a responsibility here. Anything that impacts on the Clean Air Act, the commission is designated as the federal manager of the area, which is a Class I area, entitled to protection for its integral vistas. Being an island, we have a lot of vistas from the island, of course, which would need protection. And there's no really satisfactory definition of an integral vista. You have to have it designated, and I think we finally managed to get that done. I think they're officially designated in the federal register. But each time there's a threatened impact, we have to search around, you know, for the resources to defend us, or to give us the technical advice that we need. In this case the Park Service has given us that advice and told us that with respect to this new (*unintelligible word*) Georgia Pacific, that the impact should be low, so they saw no reason for concern. But that also impacts on the Moose Horn Wildlife Refuge which is much closer, and so there's a hearing tomorrow related to that. I don't know whether the hearing will raise the issue of Campobello because the commission accepted the Park Service's evaluation on that one.

But the people who are now in vocal opposition at the hearing tomorrow, try to get some, get

involved in the Campobello case, too, I understand, so Harry, Harold Bailey will be at that hearing tomorrow and I talked to him about that today. But we simply don't have the funds to hire somebody to represent us at the hearing frankly. So he's got the documents, you know, from the Park Service and if they, it's a hearing conducted by the state park service, State Environmental Agency, so if they want to know what our records are, he'll turn them over. What I really find my responsibility is the natural area itself. Now that's something we haven't talked about at all. I mean, we were lucky that we had, and Rad Pike's name hasn't been mentioned yet in this discussion.

FP: Maybe this would be a real good time to talk about that.

EM: Yeah, he is the custodian of our environmental interests, and is view was that natural area should be left natural. I think he would probably object to what we've done on Liberty Point, but it was (*unintelligible phrase*) very clear, I had a notion of what, of his objections. I nevertheless thought that was an important thing to do because it would give, you know, it would give visitors better than anything else I could think of, you know, the natural environment in which the island rests. I think that's a magnificent view at Liberty Point. And so we've done that. I think it would have been over his opposition at the time. But he was absolutely right in his general philosophy about the park, that that's an interesting demonstration, especially in the fog forest down there near Liberty Point, of how nature repairs its own. And you don't need any assistance.

I suspect he would have opposed that road that the National Guard built for us last year. And I have had second thoughts about that, but there is an argument for it. But nevertheless I have a sneaking suspicion we shouldn't have done that. On the other hand, if we hadn't there might have been other consequences that would have been unacceptable, so since it's done we have to live with it, we can't restore it to what it was. But I'll say this, I'll be concerned about how much more gravel we take out of the park because I think that's one of the things that natural area, you know, it demonstrates that we ought not to threaten it in any way. And I'm concerned about the peat bogs, I'm concerned about anything we do that may impact on them. So it's the old dilemma of how do you create an environment which visitors can enjoy and at the same time protect what it is that they enjoy. Rad objected to use, to spraying to protect our fir trees from the, oh what is that pest that is a -

FP: Moth?

EM: Yeah, the gypsy moth. No, not the gypsy moths, what is -?

FP: (*Unintelligible word*).

EM: Anyway, that's (*unintelligible phrase*), and so we didn't. Except the ornamental trees right around the cottage, and even there we didn't do too much. If you look at them you'll see that they, they've been impacted, and they're just gorgeous old trees with the hanging moss and all that stuff. But that was his view of nature, and so he discouraged us from developments in the park area. He believed in the drives and he believed in the trails, and he believed in making the beaches accessible. And he's a wonderful guy, he's the fellow who was responsible for that

film on the ecology of the park. And a lot of Rad's records I think somewhere in the park's files on his studies of the ecology of the park. He's wonderful company, great storyteller. His death was very sudden, shocked us all. And he served as executive secretary I think one time when we had no one else to fill the spot. I don't think he ever served as superintendent, served as executive secretary. No, the park was his baby as much as it was that of any member of the commission, no question. He and Sumner, Sumner, the loss of those two was a real loss. Some of the spirit of the whole thing went when they went. We really ought to do something to commemorate their association with the park.

FP: I'm wondering, because we have Rad Pike being very involved with the natural area. Franklin had a great interest and involvement in it, and I believe Larry Stuart was also very involved, all of those, you know, are not going to be actively involved in the future. Who do you see on the commission who's going to be in the forefront of defending the natural area?

EM: Ellie Seagraves. As a matter of fact she called me this morning to find out about that hearing tomorrow. No, she's very, an avid environmentalist. A lot of the commission is to a certain extent, but of course we're all advancing in years so we've got to think about replacements who also have an environmental interest. Because that's what the park is, really, aside from the cottages. It's creating an environmental experience for people. How do you make it available to them without destroying it, that's always going to be a challenge.

FP: A lot of talk is here now about maybe trying to move people more from the cottage area to the natural area. It seems to me that it is perhaps a single unit rather than a separate one, I mean the natural area was there at the turn of the century, much of the cottage area was there, and is there thought that maybe this has a historical involvement with the cottage area and can be done as a unit rather than as separate entities?

EM: Oh, yeah, they didn't do it as separate, but the fact is of course that visitors don't think of the natural area as part of the cottage, so we've got to find ways, you know, to make that an attraction. And of course the Harvard School of Design had some ideas on this score that may be helpful. A little too ambitious for our pocket right now, but, because even things you do in a natural area cost money, no question. It costs a lot of money. You know, just keeping those drives natural looking and yet not overgrown, you know, you've got to be careful. And, you know, people, when they go to those cobble beaches, pick up the stones. If you do that too long you might destroy the cobble beaches. Unlikely as that seems, when you walk the damn things and see how many little rounded pebbles and stones there are. Those cobble beaches are things of real beauty. Maybe the average citizen coming from the city probably regards it as an unwelcome intrusion on the sand that they would prefer. The (*unintelligible word*) have some wonderful cobble beaches. You've been to the (*unintelligible word*)? I think there's some wonderful cobble beaches. We've picnicked out there and you just hear the, you know, the waves come in and you hear these stones, the rhythm of the stones rolling up the beach, then as the waves recede, rolling back. It's just as a liquid music of the sound. And you see this, you seem to get it more sharply there than on any of the beaches at Campobello. Wonderful, wonderful places.

FP: I'd like to discuss a little bit in perhaps a bit more detail some of the interrelationships

between the park, the commission, and the various governmental agencies. We've talked to some extent about our finances and that took us into the federal, national level. But I'd be interested in your recounting some of our relationship with National Parks Service. We've mentioned that we can draw technical advice and support from them. The records seem to indicate there's been a very extensive relationship between the two, sometimes smoother than at other times perhaps, which is understandable when you have two agencies working with each other. I wonder if you could just talk a little bit about us and the National Parks Service, and also Parks Canada which seems to perhaps have been a little bit less involved than the United States National Parks Service.

EM: Well I haven't been conscious of any confrontational relationship at all. I think that our budgets in the past have been filed with the Parks Service and reached the Congress through them. We've since been able to divorce ourselves from that connection because we have a special relationship with Canada on this thing and we wanted to be sure Congress understood that. And we didn't want to put the Parks Service or any federal agency in a position of being able to second guess our budget recommendations. Maybe they wouldn't let us get away with that indefinitely, but I think they've finally seen it our way this year. So depending upon how we use that authority, if we are perceived as abusing it we may have to get back into the tent with the National Parks Services. But no, I, my sense of the National Parks Service, and to a lesser extent Parks Canada, is that they're very interested in us, generally approving of what we've done. I haven't encountered any evidence of a confrontational attitude, let alone hostility. And I think they're quite free to respond to a request for assistance and advice. Now Harry may have some evidence to the contrary, but I, of course they were responsible for creating the uh, drafting the legislation that created the park. I think they were the, certainly the principle agency on our side involved in that. Maybe we haven't used them as much as we should. On the other hand we certainly haven't wanted to become ensnared in their bureaucratic jungles, that's, we kind of like being out by ourselves, making our own decisions, being able to go directly to Congress and when necessary directly to other agencies other than the Parks Service. Parks Canada, I think they're generally approving, but I'm not sure that they have a very precise picture of what we are and what our charter is. Occasionally we encounter agencies like the Canadian Customs, and now the American Customs with respect to access to the park across the border. Now I gather the U.S. Customs wants to charge tradesmen and -

End of Side A
Side B

EM: border. Now I gather the U.S. Customs wants to charge tradesmen and plumbers, I think, we've had to use, you know, come across the bridge, charge them fifteen dollars when they leave, which we think is a violation of our statute so we'll see if we can straighten that out. So occasionally you have that kind of a confrontation in the past with, I think every year with respect to Canadian Customs. Harry clears the policy, or hehas the policy redefine- (*break in taping*), which helps us to avoid a lot of the red tape, (*break in taping*). I can't think of other agencies, well the National Guard has of course responded to us generously as I'm sure you know. The Army Corps of Engineers is responding very generously on that lighthouse project. Let's see, who else have we had to deal with? Well, the Parks Service on the air quality problems.

No, I think Attorney General William Frank [French] Smith, that was his name, William Frank [French] Smith, you know, who violated the, not only the spirit but I think the letter of that statute which Congress created and which Parliament created on the Canadian side, directing agencies to respond to our requests for assistance. They didn't want to see the park create a whole bureaucracy around this park. They wanted to create a commission, and they wanted to make available to us the resources of each government to manage it. By and large, we've had excellent cooperation, but once in a while we get a stinker like William Frank [French] Smith. Don't use that word in the written history.

FP: No, not in the written history. In the, I'd be interested now in talking a little bit about the impact of the park on the local community and the relationships there. The park is a major factor, obviously, of Campobello. I mean, Wilson's Beach, Welsh Pool, and also Lubec-Eastport area. I wonder if you can recall some of the developments, maybe some problems or some good factors in our relationship between the two and what the commission has done to assure that we maintain good relationships.

EM: Well, I can't remember exact dates, but it seems to me, about the time, I think we've already gone into that somewhat, we were acquiring land, there was some concern on the island that maybe we were too expansive in our view of the future of the park. But we became sensitized to that and as I think your tape will show that we did not go beyond Lakeland Southern Road really. Although we had opportunities which we've already discussed to do so. And maybe too conservatively so, but we were very conscious at reaching those decisions of the importance of reassuring people that we weren't going to gobble their island up. At the same time, of course, they wanted to be sure that the island benefitted from the economic impacts of the park, and on at least one and maybe two occasions we got down to very specifics, you know, how many people do you employ, how many of them are Canadians, what are they paid and, you know, is there a need of division? And we've had to be very specific about that. I can remember studies that we made that showed how many employees were Canadian and how many American, and on the whole I think it was heavily on the side of Canadians, but there were American employees. We try consciously to make as close as we can an even division of the resources that we spend in the Canadian economy and those we spend in the American economy. We have a Canadian bank to deposit funds, and an American bank.

One of the stickiest ones has been on pay because the problem is of course that the Canadian government you know matches our government's contribution in dollars, which is a real windfall for the American side. And that fact has been caught up in the fact that the employees of the Canadian Park on the island, the Provincial Park, you know, get paid much less than the American employees on the American side, and at one point we were making up, we were giving Canadian employees the equivalent of what the American employees were getting. I mean, that was a sticky thing. How do you handle it? Well, from one point of view, some Canadians on the commission were worried, you know, that they would be criticized because employees of the Provincial Park were getting paid, and Canadian employees of the Campobello Park. I forget where it stands now, whether we still make that, whether we still, I think that we were finally able to prevail so the Canadian is in effect paying these higher salaries to Americans. How can

you argue that they shouldn't pay the same to Canadian employees? And I think eighty percent of the employees roughly are, maybe that's not right, are Canadians. But whatever it is, I think we finally agreed to agree that we have to treat all employees of the park the same, and if we have to adjust it upward for American employees in order that their pay be comparable to, say, Acadia National Park and American parks, that in all equity we had to pay Canadian employees the same thing. And none of them are getting rich, it isn't as though that were the case. But that had been a, I wouldn't say a confrontational problem, but a sticky one that the commission on both sides were worried about it, and we handled it differently from time to time, we weren't exactly sure what would work out, but we seemed to be settled into an acceptable routine so that's no longer an issue. But that was a tough one.

And of course the merchants on the island were concerned that we might not be buying as much from them as we ought to be. Well, when we finally showed them the balance sheet taking everything into account, you know, our bank deposits, Canadian employees, the American employees and all the rest, we probably were being as even handed as they could reasonably ask, because if we could get something on the island, we'd buy it on the island. If we can't, we'd get it where we can. (*Unintelligible phrase*) and Harry certainly is, he's the keeper of the treasury, I guess we've got to rely on him to do it, and I think he's done a good job.

FP: You feel over all, then, in the twenty five years the commission has done a good job at maintaining friendly relations with its neighbors.

EM: I would think so, and I think that Harry periodically has a party at the park for people on the island and employees, that sort of thing, and we, I don't know what the, what our policy is now on, with respect to hunting on park property in the deer season. I think we gave them that at one point. Now I guess most of them go over on the mainland to hunt deer rather than on the park. But at one time they wanted that privilege, so we haven't, and at another time they used to cut those small trees, you know, for their fishing weirs, on park property which we didn't like too much but, well it's worked out, I don't think they denuded our forest with that sort of thing. You've got to be relaxed about the relationships.

FP: I think there have been times when we have perhaps made donations to help civic activities in the area.

EM: Yeah, there have been. We, particularly with activities that were relevant to the park. I think we turned down recently a couple of requests we've had, I forget what they are, the records will show what they were, but we've been less able to. I mean, if we hadn't been so tight for money we probably would have agreed to some of those. But if you have to say no to something, well, once in a while you have to.

FP: I think we've gone through just about all of the specific issues. Before we get into a broad overview, I was wondering if there were any specific issues that you would like to get on the record, or that I've overlooked.

EM: No, I've probably forgotten more of them than you have. But there's been just, you know, there's been just enough issues to keep it interesting. There really haven't been, none of these

issues we've raised have been life and death issues.

FP: Well, I'd like to ask a few general questions, and this is, I'd like to go at it with the idea that the tape we're making now we like to call an oral history, and I can imagine twenty-five years from now somebody coming in and trying to write the fifty year anniversary history of the park by listening to this record. And I'd like you to tell that person in your own words what you think he should hear, and what should he know about the first twenty-five years of the park, how it has developed, where it is going in the future. And we've talked about this in light of each specific subject, but I wonder if we could maybe draw it all together and have you express a general voice to the future of the park, if you will.

EM: Well, I think that, I think that the park has evolved very well, very successfully, and it's been done with very conservative policies, I think, relative to expansion and costs. But we may have been fortunate in a way that the park may not be fortunate again in the future in that the area has been a pretty stable area economically, and has sort of been fixed in time. You sort of get the idea when you visit the island, you know, that it's probably, well not so much now with what's happening with the Campobello Stage Company, that it might have looked the same way, you know, fifty years ago. So we haven't had to worry about demographics or growing pressures on the park. (*Unintelligible word*) that visitation at the park has grown, it's been relatively modest. I don't know what the visitation was twenty years ago, I don't remember it, but I don't know. I suspect we've more than a hundred thousand or thereabouts, now about a hundred and fifty. And that isn't a big growth, and so it hasn't imposed any pressures on our facilities, and I think that may change now for reasons that were identified in the Harvard Design study. And that has to be looked at very carefully.

Another thing that I wonder about, you know, is how long will the Roosevelt memory be sufficient to sustain the park? By that I mean how long will people think it is important for the park, say, to grow, to respond to these pressures and that will tax its facilities. How maybe as community memory fades, forces for expansion may not emerge. So then what will keep it alive? It seems to me the natural area is about the only part of the park that holds that kind of attraction for people. So a lot of thought will have to be given to that. And I think the Harvard Design study focused on those pressures, especially on the water, on the water sides of the park.

So twenty-five years from now the park may be a very unimportant factor in the life of the island. I hope not, but as you look at some of these other memorials to distinguished people in our past, there's not much life to many of them. Even the presidential libraries, you go there and there are people, you know, who use them, historians to do research. And I guess the public visitation is pretty good. I don't have any statistics on them. Hyde Park, for example, Hyde Park, you know, you might get those statistics. I'd be interested to see how the visitation numbers have gone over the years. Are they falling off, or are they still, and of course Hyde Park is in a very populace area of the country, very accessible. I haven't been all that enthusiastic about presidential libraries. I've finally come to conclude that they're a good thing in that they make available to the citizenry of the country access to the sort of presidential papers and the presidential memorabilia, that that's a good thing to do, but how much they're inclined to use them I don't know. Some of them are pretty magnificent. Truman's pretty modest, Hyde

Park you'll find is pretty modest compared to some of the most recent ones. I'm sure that Gerald Ford, who was president only two years, has a more magnificent, I haven't been there, more magnificent structure than FDR's in Hyde Park. I think FDR built that one, if I remember correctly, and then gave it to them.

So really, I think our big challenge for the park is to make it a continuing focus of public interest that will attract visitors. And if we do that job, if the park does that job well, then it's because and only because we have found ways to make it an attraction. So you got to think about it constantly, you can't just rest and say, well, we got the cottages down there finished. Sure, you have to continue to maintain them and all that business, but you've got to find things for people to do, and to make them interested in it. One of the things about the park that do interest people (*unintelligible word*) are the gardens, very clearly, the vistas, Friar's Head, and I suspect Eagle Hill would be that, Liberty Point, so the vistas. The beaches, people do love to walk beaches wherever they are, and those in the natural area are particularly interesting because, especially that one on Racoon Beach, where you have to go down those steep stairs all the way down, you really feel, you know, you're in a world by yourself when you get there. I think the new steps down Friar's Head to the Old Friar ought to be a very interesting, and I haven't done that yet. I don't know if I'm up to climbing back up those stairs, they must be pretty steep. Have you done that?

FP: Yes, they are steep.

EM: Is that an interesting walk?

FP: I like it.

EM: So you've got to have something to find to do, and maybe, you know, bus rides, I don't know, somehow that, bus rides into the natural area, that doesn't seem natural to me. That may be the only way we can people to go down there, but I hope they would just naturally gravitate that way, given the proper direction and impetus, maybe bicycles? They could rent out bicycles if they'd like to, but I'm afraid you'd lose a lot of bicycles, and you couldn't charge them enough rent to offset the, you know, to make stealing them a deterrent. So I don't know that bicycles would work. Maybe something like the, what do they call those, they're not wagons but those horse drawn vehicles they have in Central Park in New York, maybe something like that might work. But then you'd have to have somebody going in back of you cleaning up, I suppose. Who was it originally, the shovel brigade? The shovel brigade. But anyway, things like that, I mean the sort of things that Harvard Design Group talked about. And I think the greatest potential for that right now is the area between the cottage and Friar's Head, I think if we acquire the rest of those properties the idea of the four freedom paths, with appropriate signing, you know, to give people the message, I mean that would combine a walk to the Friar's Head, Friar, Friar's Head. And I think people could very easily and naturally gravitate to that, where it would take them a hell of a lot longer to get the idea that Liberty Point is worth visiting. And once they visited Friar's Head and see that, then maybe they'd be interested in Liberty Point. So that part of the Harvard Design thing does have interest for me, and it wouldn't cost that much if we could acquire the land, that particular thing. It seems to me that's a doable thing. Maybe even with our in-house crews. I would like that, and that would be sort of a cross between a conventional

park and the natural area. It wouldn't be a natural area but it would be sufficiently so, so that it would worthwhile experiencing. And they'd get the idea from that of what made this island attractive to FDR.

FP: And one last question I would have maybe in summing up is how you see the park and the commission as exemplifying the original concept of international cooperation and friendship between the United States and Canada.

EM: Well, of course the fact that we continue to cooperate in supporting the park is the most tangible expression of that. There's never been any reluctance on either side to continue the park. As a matter of fact, there's been a high level of interest in it. I think the appointment of commissioners has been regarded as a serious responsibility. I guess we may be as challenged as the Canadians to raise their sights on that one. So it's important that we get, you know, prestigious people to serve on the American side, (*unintelligible word*) as we have Cohen. I'm worried about, I won't say worry, but I think I have reason to wonder how that will proceed. I mean, I've done it sort of as a hobby and since I've, you know, have been successful in my Senate career I suppose I've given the commission some clout that it might not have had otherwise. I mean, suppose for example that the three Americans were some official from the Parks Service and someone from the Maine Park Service, no political figures, might be viewed as a bureaucratic entity at this point. So I think it's important to maintain its political discipline. Maybe we can depend on the Maine delegation to do that. But you don't want all politicians on it. So that's an issue that may come up and it has been avoided because of the unlimited terms of the present members. But time is running out.

FP: Well I think we've covered quite a bit of material in the last few days. And I've basically exhausted the area that I wanted to cover. I'll give you one last shot for posterity's sake if there's anything else you'd like to say for the oral history tape before we turn it off.

EM: I don't think so.

FP: Okay, I think we can turn it off.

End of Interview
moh018.int